



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

OCA 3449-89
URGENT

OCA FILE

September 29, 1989

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

National Security Council (Lampley x3723)
Department of State (Bachrach 647-4463)
Department of Defense (Brick 697-1305)
Central Intelligence Agency 482

249

225

325

STAT

SUBJECT: In addition to the ACDA materials sent to you earlier today, we are now transmitting for your review an additional set of ACDA prepared draft questions and answers asked of Mr. Hanmer at his confirmation hearing to become ACDA's Deputy Director.

NOTE: This material must be up on the Hill by October 3rd so your prompt response is essential. We will assume your agency has no comments if you have not responded within the deadline.

The Office of Management and Budget requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

A response to this request for your views is needed no later than 3:00 P.M., MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1989.

Questions should be referred to **JEFF ASHFORD (395-3920)**.

RONALD K. PETERSON FOR
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference

Enclosures

cc: B. Smith
D. Taft

URGENT

Q.4. Should OSIA receive policy guidance from ACDA? Does OSIA respond adequately to requests for information or reports from ACDA?

A.4. Policy relevant to implementation of the INF Treaty is developed, coordinated, and approved on an inter-Agency basis in accordance with the National Security Council's system of Policy Coordinating Committees (PCC). The Director of ACDA fulfills his statutory responsibilities within the framework of the PCC, and ACDA officials are integral to all levels of PCC activity. The procedures under which the OSIA functions are constantly under review with the aim of refinements, and improvements when necessary.

Q.5. Will the CARGOSCAN be operational at the Votkinsk Portal in the Soviet Union by December 1, 1989? If so, why will it be one year late? If not, what steps are you taking to finally expedite its installation? Are there plans for a second system to be used for research and development and possibly for START? (U)

A.5. The Cargoscan system is in transit now and the U.S. expects to ship it until the Soviet Union beginning on October 2. Once it is in the Soviet Union, the Soviets will likely exercise their right under the treaty to examine the equipment to assure themselves that it cannot perform functions connected with the inspection requirements of the treaty. Taking into account the time required to install and test the equipment at Votkinsk, the U.S. expects to have Cargoscan in operation at Votkinsk within a couple of months after installation begins. (U)

With respect to the timing, the INF Treaty requires the parties to agree on the characteristics and methods of use of inspection equipment such as Cargoscan. For Cargoscan, these negotiations took into late 1988 to complete and were followed by equipment modifications and testing of the modified equipment. This process has been completed and Cargoscan is now being shipped to the Soviet Union. (U)

Q-9: What was accomplished by the notification agreement?

A-9: The agreement on Reciprocal Advance Notification of Major Strategic Exercises is designed to increase the transparency of each side's activities regarding a major strategic force exercise involving heavy bombers. In so doing, the agreement will build confidence between the sides that the occurrence of a large-scale training exercise involving strategic nuclear forces will not be misinterpreted as a threat to the other side. It will thus reduce the risk of misunderstanding and outbreak of nuclear war. (U)

Q15. The U.S. withdrawal of its longstanding proposal to ban mobile ICBMs in START is "contingent on the funding by the U.S. Congress of U.S. mobile ICBMs." Does this mean that Congress must agree to fund both the rail mobile MX and the Midgetmen systems? What funding levels, deployment levels, and initial operational capability dates must Congress approve in order for the U.S. to remove its proposed START ban on mobile ICBM deployment?

A15. The Administration has proposed a program to the Congress for funding for both land- and rail-mobile ICBM development, production and deployment. Congressional support for this program, at the funding levels requested, is essential if we are to negotiate a START agreement. (U)

Given their continuing deployment of the mobile SS-24 and SS-25 ICBMs, it is unlikely that the Soviets would accept a START agreement which bans mobile ICBMs. However, we cannot accept an agreement permitting mobiles unless the U.S. has them as well. Thus, Congressional support for mobile ICBMs is absolute requirement for START. (U)

Corrected
A15

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

*2nd & final
set*

September 29, 1989

TO: Sue Thau, Joan Killgore - OMB

FROM: Linda Emery - ACDA/OCA *LE*

SUBJECT: Request for Interagency Clearance

Attached are ACDA's proposed responses to questions posed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to Mr. S. Read Hanmer during his confirmation hearing. Mr. Hanmer has been nominated to become ACDA's Deputy Director.

We anticipate that the SFRC will be conducting a business meeting on Wednesday, October 4. We therefore need inter-agency clearance on the answers by COB Monday, Oct. 2.

Thank you for your assistance.